arXiv:1408.1737v1 [math.PR] 8 Aug 2014

LIMIT THEOREMS AND GOVERNING EQUATIONS FOR LÉVY WALKS

M. MAGDZIARZ, H.P. SCHEFFLER, P. STRAKA, AND P. ZEBROWSKI

Abstract. The Lévy Walk is the process with continuous sample paths which arises from consecutive linear motions of i.i.d. lengths with i.i.d. directions. Assuming speed 1 and motions in the domain of β-stable attraction, we prove functional limit theorems and derive governing pseudo-differential equations for the law of the walker's position. Both Lévy Walk and its limit process are continuous and ballistic in the case $\beta \in (0,1)$. In the case $\beta \in (1,2)$, the scaling limit of the process is β-stable and hence discontinuous. This case exhibits an interesting situation in which scaling exponent $1/\beta$ on the process level is seemingly unrelated to the scaling exponent $3-\beta$ of the second moment. For $\beta = 2$, the scaling limit is Brownian motion.

1. Introduction

The Continuous Time Random Walk (CTRW) is a stochastic process determined uniquely by $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued i.i.d. random vectors $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots$ representing consecutive jumps of the random walker, and $\mathbb{R}_+$-valued i.i.d. random variables $J_1, J_2, \ldots$ representing waiting times between jumps. The trajectories of CTRWs are step functions with intervals J_i and jumps Y_i. Taking $J_1 = J_2 = \ldots = 1$ we obtain the classical random walk process. CTRWs were introduced for the first time in the pioneering work of Montroll and Weiss [39]. Since then they became one of the most popular and useful models in statistical physics [28]. Their first spectacular application can be found in [40], in which CTRWs with heavy-tailed waiting times were used as a model of charge carrier transport in amorphous semiconductors. Today CTRWs are well established mathematical models, particularly attractive in the modeling of anomalous dynamics characterized by nonlinear in time mean square displacement $\mathrm{Var}(X(t)) \sim t^\alpha$, $\alpha \neq 1$, see [38] and references therein.

The main mathematical challenges in the study of CTRWs are limit theorems on the stochastic process level and governing equations describing evolution in time of the corresponding probability density functions. There is an extensive literature in this field: general results for the scaling limits of CTRWs on the stochastic process level can be found in [6, 7, 29, 35, 37, 44, 45]. Governing equations for the densities of the CTRW limits and the related fractional Cauchy problems were analyzed in [2, 4, 20, 23, 33, 37, 45]. Some recent results for particular classes of correlated and coupled CTRWs can be found in [17, 24, 30, 31, 47]

The trajectories of CTRW are step functions, thus they are discontinuous. However, the usual physical requirement for a mathematical model is to have continuous realizations. The straightforward remedy for this problem is to interpolate the "stair,"

which results from a waiting time and an instantaneous jump, by a linear motion during the waiting interval. As a result one obtains a stochastic process with continuous, piecewise linear trajectories – a proper model of a physical system.

Although much is known about asymptotic properties of CTRWs, there are no such results for interpolated CTRWs. The only one exception that we are aware of are the classical random walks. In this case the linearly interpolated version has exactly the same limit (in the M_1 topology) as the random walk itself, see Corollary 6.2.1 in [48]. As our results will show, the situation can be drastically different for CTRWs and their linearly interpolated counterparts – the limits can differ significantly.

In this paper we will concentrate on the class of *Lévy walks*. Let us take CTRW satisfying $\|Y_i\| = J_i$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ (length of the jump equal to the length of the preceding waiting time). Next, take the linearly interpolated version of this CTRW. The obtained process is called a Lévy walk (see the next section for its formal definition). It is important to note that in the literature the term Lévy Walk is also used for *uninterpolated* CTRWs with $\|Y_i\| = J_i$; in fact the first definition of Lévy Walks in [26] was of this kind (see also [27]) in the framework of generalized master equations. Since then, the Lévy walk became one of the most popular models in statistical physics with large number of important applications. The main idea underlying the Lévy walk is the coupled spatial-temporal memory in the CTRW, which is manifested by the condition $\|Y_i\| = J_i$. Thus, even if we assume that the distribution of jumps Y_i is heavy-tailed with diverging moments, the Lévy walk itself has finite moments of all orders (intuitively, long jumps are penalized by requiring more time to be performed). This is very different from α-stable Lévy processes with $\alpha < 2$, which have infinite variance. Moreover, the trajectories of the Lévy walk are continuous and piecewise linear. These desirable properties make the Lévy walk particularly attractive for physical applications. Lévy walks have been found to be excellent models in the description of various real-life phenomena and complex anomalous systems. The most striking examples are: transport of light in optical materials [5], foraging patterns of animals [8,9,14], epidemic spreading [12,15], human travel [13, 19], blinking nano-crystals [32], and fluid flow in a rotating annulus [43].

In this paper we prove functional limit theorems and derive governing equations for Lévy walks. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic study of linearly interpolated CTRWs and their limits. Our results show that, in contrast to the standard random walk, the scaling limit of a linearly interpolated CTRW can be different from the scaling limit of the corresponding CTRW. Our results are presented in the following way: We introduce the model in Section 2 and clarify some distributional scaling limits (stable laws) in Section 3. In Section 4 we prove the weak convergence of rescaled Lévy Walks in Skorokhod space. Finally, Section 5 contains a derivation of the pseudo-differential governing equation for the probability density of the scaling limit process.

2. The model

Let $S^{m-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|x\|_2 = 1\}$ be the unit-sphere and let λ be any distribution on S^{m-1} modeling the *directions* of the random walker. To avoid degenerate cases we further assume that $\mathrm{supp}(\lambda)$ spans $\mathbb{R}^m$, where $\mathrm{supp}(\lambda)$ denotes the support of

λ. Let $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots$ be i.i.d. on S^{m-1} with distribution λ. Moreover, let $J_1, J_2, \dots$ be i.i.d. $\mathbb{R}_+$-valued random variables modeling the random moving times. We also assume that (Λ_i) and (J_i) are independent. Set $T(0) = 0$ and $T(n) = \sum_{i=1}^n J_i$. Then $T(0), T(1), T(2), \dots$ are the times where the walker changes direction. Set $S(0) = 0$ and let $S(n) = \sum_{j=1}^n J_j \Lambda_j$, the position after the n-the movement. Let $N_t = \max\{n \geq 0 : T(n) \leq t\}$. Then the *Lévy Walk* $W = \{W(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is defined as the stochastic process

$$W(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} J_j \Lambda_j + \big(t - T(N_t)\big)\Lambda_{N_t+1}. \tag{2.1}$$

Observe that $W(t)$ is right-continuous by construction. Moreover we have $N_t = n$ if and only if $T(n) \leq t < T(n+1)$. Hence, as $t \uparrow T(n+1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} W(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} J_j \Lambda_j + (t - T(n))\Lambda_{n+1} \\ &\to \sum_{j=1}^{n} J_j \Lambda_j + (T(n+1) - T(n))\Lambda_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} J_j \Lambda_j = W(T(n+1)), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that W has *continuous* sample paths. Moreover, by construction we have $\|W(t)\| \leq t$ and hence the moments of $W(t)$ are finite for all orders, even if $E(J_1) = \infty$.

3. Distributional assumptions

We assume that the distribution of J_i belongs to the domain of attraction [34] of some β-stable law with $\beta \in (0, 1)$. This means that there exist $b_n > 0$ such that we have the following weak convergence of random variables:

$$b_n T(n) \Longrightarrow D \quad \text{as } n \to \infty, \tag{3.1}$$

where D follows a β-stable law supported on $[0, \infty)$ with Laplace-transform $E[e^{-sD}] = e^{-s^\beta}$. Here $\Longrightarrow$ denotes convergence in distribution. The law of D is infinitely divisible with Lévy measure

$$\phi_D(dt) = \frac{\beta}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} t^{-\beta-1} dt, \tag{3.2}$$

and the remaining parts of the Lévy triplet vanish. The following result provides the joint convergence of $(S(n), T(n))$:

Theorem 3.3. *We have the following weak convergence of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+$:*

$$\big(b_n S(n), b_n T(n)\big) \Longrightarrow (A, D) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

The limiting random variable (A, D) has a full (meaning "not supported on a proper hyperplane") multivariate β-stable law on $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Its Lévy-measure ϕ is given by

$$\phi(dr, d\theta, dt) = \varepsilon_t(dr)\lambda(d\theta)\phi_D(dt), \tag{3.5}$$

where the x-coordinate of $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ is given in polar form $x = r \cdot \theta$, $r > 0$, $\theta \in S^{m-1}$ and ε_t denotes the Dirac measure. Moreover, A is multivariate β-stable on $\mathbb{R}^m$ with spectral measure λ and Lévy-measure

$$\phi_A(dr, d\theta) = \frac{\beta}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} r^{-\beta-1} dr\, \lambda(d\theta). \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. For $u > 0$ and a Borel-set $V \subset S^{m-1}$ let

$$B(u,V) = \big\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|x\|_2 > u, \frac{x}{\|x\|_2} \in V \big\}$$

and write ∂V for the topological boundary of V. Then according to [34, Th. 3.2.2] (3.4) holds if we can show for any $u, s > 0$ and V with $\lambda(\partial V) = 0$ that

$$nP\big\{ b_n J_1 \Lambda_1 \in B(u,V), b_n J_1 > s \big\} \to \phi\big(B(u,V) \times (s,\infty)\big) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty \tag{3.7}$$

where ϕ is given by (3.5). Now (3.1) and (3.2) imply that

$$nP\{b_n J_1 > s\} \to \phi_D(s,\infty) = \frac{s^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Hence, by independence of J_1 and Λ_1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} nP\big\{ b_n J_1 \Lambda_1 \in B(u,V), b_n J_1 > s \big\} &= nP\big\{ b_n J_1 > u, \Lambda_1 \in V, b_n J_1 > s \big\} \\ &= nP\big\{ b_n J_1 > \max(u,s) \big\} \cdot P\big\{ \Lambda_1 \in V \big\} \\ &\to \frac{\max(u,s)^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \lambda(V). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we get from (3.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi\big(B(u,V) \times (s,\infty)\big) &= \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{m-1}} \int_0^\infty 1_{B(u,V)}(r \cdot \theta) 1_{(s,\infty)}(t)\, \varepsilon_t(dr)\, \lambda(d\theta) \phi_D(dt) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{m-1}} 1_{B(u,V)}(t \cdot \theta) 1_{(s,\infty)}(t)\, \lambda(d\theta) \phi_D(dt) \\ &= \lambda(V) \int_0^\infty 1_{(\max(u,s),\infty)}(t)\, \phi_D(dt) \\ &= \frac{\max(u,s)^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \lambda(V), \end{aligned}$$

so (3.7) holds. For the proof of (3.6) observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_A\big(B(u,V)\big) &= \phi\big(B(u,V) \times \mathbb{R}_+\big) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{m-1}} \int_0^\infty 1_{B(u,V)}(r \cdot \theta)\, \varepsilon_t(dr)\, \lambda(d\theta)\, \phi_D(dt) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{m-1}} 1_{B(u,V)}(t \cdot \theta)\, \lambda(d\theta)\, \phi_D(dt) \\ &= \lambda(V) \phi_D(t,\infty). \end{aligned}$$

The assumption on the support of λ implies that $\mathrm{supp}(\phi)$ spans $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ and hence (A, D) has a full distribution. This concludes the proof. □

Since the limit (A, D) in (3.4) is infinitely divisible, we know from Lemma 2.1 in [7] that the Fourier-Laplace transform of (A, D) for $k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $s \geq 0$ is given by

$$\bar{P}_{(A,D)}(k,s) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_0^\infty e^{-st} e^{i\langle k,x\rangle} \, P_{(A,D)}(dx,dt) = e^{-\psi(k,s)},$$

where

$$\psi(k,s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_0^\infty \big(1 - e^{-st} e^{i\langle k,x\rangle}\big) \, \phi(dx,dt)$$

and $\phi(dx,dt)$ is the Lévy measure of (A, D).

Lemma 3.8. *We have for $k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $s \geq 0$ that*

$$\psi(k,s) = \int_{S^{m-1}} \big(s - i\langle k,\theta\rangle\big)^\beta \, \lambda(d\theta). \tag{3.9}$$

Especially we have

$$\psi_A(k) = \psi(k,0) = \int_{S^{m-1}} \big(-i\langle k,\theta\rangle\big)^\beta \, \lambda(d\theta)$$
$$\psi_D(s) = \psi(0,s) = s^\beta.$$

Proof. Using (3.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(k,s) &= \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{m-1}} \int_0^\infty \big(1 - e^{-st} e^{i\langle k, r\theta\rangle}\big) \, \phi(dr, d\theta, dt) \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{m-1}} \big(1 - e^{-st} e^{i\langle k,t\theta\rangle}\big) \, \lambda(d\theta) \, \phi_D(dt) \\
&= \int_{S^{m-1}} \int_0^\infty \big(1 - e^{-t(s - i\langle k,\theta\rangle)}\big) \, \phi_D(dt) \, \lambda(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{S^{m-1}} \big(s - i\langle k,\theta\rangle\big)^\beta \, \lambda(d\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Note that the symbol $\psi(k,s)$ in (3.9) defines a pseudo-differential operator, which by the form of the Lévy measure in (3.5), for bounded C^1 functions takes the form

$$\psi(i\nabla_x, \partial_t) f(x,t) = \int_{S^{m-1}} \big(\partial_t + \langle \theta, \nabla_x\rangle\big)^\beta f(x,t) \, \lambda(d\theta) \tag{3.10}$$

where $(\partial_t + \langle \theta, \nabla_x\rangle)^\beta$ is the *fractional material derivative* in direction θ, given by

$$\big(\partial_t + \langle \theta, \nabla_x\rangle\big)^\beta f(x,t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \int_0^\infty \big(f(x + r\theta, t + r) - f(x,t)\big) r^{-\beta-1} \, dr. \tag{3.11}$$

See the references [3, 36, 42] for details.

If we let $b(c) = b_{[c]}$ then $b(c)$ is regularly varying with index $-1/\beta$. Moreover it follows from Theorem 16.14 in [25] that (3.4) implies convergence of the corresponding stochastic processes

$$\big\{(b(c)S(\lfloor ct\rfloor), b(c)T(\lfloor ct\rfloor))\big\}_{t\geq 0} \xrightarrow{J_1} \big\{(A(t), D(t))\big\}_{t\geq 0} \tag{3.12}$$

as $c \to \infty$, where $\{(A(t), D(t))\}_{t\geq 0}$ is the Lévy process associates to (A, D) with FLT $\bar{P}_{(A(t),D(t))}(k, s) = e^{-t\psi(k,s)}$ where $\psi(k, s)$ is given by (3.9).

Proposition 3.13. (1) *For any $u > 0$ the distribution of $(A(u), D(u))$ is supported on the cone*

$$K = \big\{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+ : \|x\| \leq t, t \geq 0\big\}.$$

(2) *The probability law of $(A(1), D(1)) = (A, D)$ admits a Lebesgue density $p(x, t)$.*
(3) *$(A(u), D(u))$ is Lebesgue absolutely continuous with density*

$$p_u(x, t) = u^{-(m+1)/\beta} p(u^{-1/\beta}x, u^{-1/\beta}t).$$

(4) *For all (x, t) in the interior of K, the density $p_u(x, t) > 0$ is strictly positive.*

Proof. Observe that by (3.5) the Lévy measure of (A, D) is supported on

$$S = \big\{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+ : \|x\| = t, t \geq 0\big\}.$$

Moreover, by assumption on λ we know that $\mathrm{supp}(\phi)$ spans $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Since the closed convex cone generated by S equals K, assertions (1), (2) and (4) follow from Theorem 2 in [1]. (3) is a simple consequence of the stability property. □

4. The Limit Theorem

In this section, we give a functional limit theorem for Lévy walks, i.e. we prove scaling limit theorems for $\{W(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ on the level of stochastic processes, using the continuous mapping theorem on Skorokhod spaces of sample paths.

We first clarify our notation. For a separable metric space E (here, E will be $\mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbb{R}$), write $\mathbb{D}(E)$ for the set of r.c.l.l. paths in E. By this we mean the maps from $[0, \infty)$ to E which are right-continuous with left-hand limits. For $x \in \mathbb{D}(E)$, write $x^- : t \mapsto x(t-)$ if $t > 0$, and set $x^-(0) = x(0)$; we call x^- the l.c.r.l. (or "left-continuous with right-hand limits") version of x. Write $\mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow} \subset \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R})$ for all unbounded and non-decreasing paths y in $\mathbb{R}$. For $y \in \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow}$, define the *inverse path* $y^{-1}(t) = \inf\{s : y(s) > t\}$. We note that y^{-1} is r.c.l.l. and $y^{-1} \in \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow}$. If $x \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $y \in \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow}$, then it can be checked that the composition $x \circ y$ is again r.c.l.l. and thus defines an element in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, $x^- \circ y^-$ is l.c.r.l. For its r.c.l.l. version we write $(x^- \circ y^-)^+$, and note that it is defined via $(x^- \circ y^-)^+(t) = (x^- \circ y^-)(t+)$. Finally, we write $\mathrm{disc}(x) := \{t \geq 0 : x^-(t) \neq x(t)\}$ for the set of discontinuities of a r.c.l.l. or l.c.r.l. path x.

Throughout this section, we let

$$\begin{array}{lll} a \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m) & d \in \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow} & e = d^{-1} \\ x = (a^- \circ e^-)^+ & y = a \circ e & \\ g = (d^- \circ e^-)^+ & h = d \circ e & \end{array}$$

and write $\mathcal{R}(d) := \{d(t) : t \geq 0\}$ for the range of d. We say that t is a left-limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d)$ if there exists a sequence $\{t_n\} \subset \mathcal{R}(d)$ such that $t_n < t$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = t$. "Right-limit point" is then defined similarly. Recall that $e \in \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow}$.

We say that e is right-increasing at t if $u > t \Rightarrow e(u) > e(t)$, and left-increasing if $0 \le s < t \Rightarrow e(s) < e(t)$. For later use, we note that it can be checked that

$$t \text{ is a right-limit point of } \mathcal{R}(d) \Leftrightarrow e \text{ is right-increasing at } t \Leftrightarrow h(t) = t,$$
$$t \text{ is a left-limit point of } \mathcal{R}(d) \Leftrightarrow e^- \text{ is left-increasing at } t \Leftrightarrow g^-(t) = t$$

We define the Lévy Walk path mapping as follows:

$$\Phi : \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow} \to \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m)$$
$$(a, d) \mapsto w$$

where

$$w(t) = \begin{cases} x(t) & \text{if } t \in \mathcal{R}(d) \\ x(t) + \dfrac{t - g(t)}{h(t) - g(t)}(y(t) - x(t)) & \text{if } t \notin \mathcal{R}(d) \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Lemma 4.3 below shows that Φ is well-defined. We will see later that Φ maps the paths of the rescaled cumulative process $(b_n S(\cdot), b_n T(\cdot))$ to the paths of the Lévy Walk W. We also note that since $g(t) \le t \le h(t)$, the fraction in (4.1) lies in the interval $[0, 1]$ for every $t \ge 0$. Hence we have

$$w(t) \in [x(t), y(t)], \quad t \ge 0, \tag{4.2}$$

where $[x(t), y(t)]$ denotes the compact linear segment $\subset \mathbb{R}^m$ of points between $x(t)$ and $y(t)$. The experienced reader may think of x as a CTRW path, and of y as an overshooting CTRW path (or lagging and leading CTRW path).

Lemma 4.3. *If $t \notin \mathcal{R}(d)$, then $h(t) > g(t)$. Moreover, w is r.c.l.l.*

Proof. Since d is non-decreasing and r.c.l.l., $\mathcal{R}(d)$ is right-closed [21, p.146], i.e. closed in the topology generated by all intervals of the form $[u, v) \subset [0, \infty)$. It follows that $t \notin \mathcal{R}(d)$ cannot be a right-limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d)$. This implies $t < h(t)$, and clearly $g(t) \le t$.

For the remaining statement, let $t \ge 0$. Throughout, t_n is a sequence with $\lim t_n = t$. We write $t_n \uparrow t$ if additionally $t_n < t$, and $t_n \downarrow t$ if $t_n > t$.

We consider the following exhaustive list of cases:

Case 1: $t \notin \mathcal{R}(d)$, t is neither left nor right limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d)$. It follows that e and hence g, h, x and y are constant in a neighbourhood of t. Thus w is continuous at t.

Case 2: $t \notin \mathcal{R}(d)$, t a left-limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d)$ (but not a right-limit point). Let $t_n \downarrow t$. Then for large n, $t_n \notin \mathcal{R}(d)$, and $g(t_n) = t$, $h(t_n) = h(t) > t$, and thus $w(t_n) \to x(t) = w(t)$ since x is r.c.l.l., and it follows that w is right-continuous at t. Now let $t_n \uparrow t$. We observe that $e(t_n) \uparrow e^-(t)$, and hence $y(t_n) = a(e(t_n)) \to a^-(e^-(t)) = x^-(t)$, which means $x^-(t) = y^-(t)$. But then (4.2) implies that the left-hand limit of w at t exists and equals $w^-(t) = x^-(t)$.

Case 3: $t \in \mathcal{R}(d)$, t is neither left nor right limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d)$ (i.e. an isolated point). Let $t_n \downarrow t$. For large n, $t_n \notin \mathcal{R}(d)$. Then $h(t_n) = h(t) > t$ and $g(t_n) = g(t)$. It follows that $w(t_n) \to x(t) = w(t)$, and w is right-continuous at t. Now let $t_n \uparrow t$. Again for large n, $t_n \notin \mathcal{R}(d)$. Then $g(t_n) = g^-(t) < t$ and $h(t_n) = t$. The fraction converges to 1, and $\lim w(t_n) = y^-(t)$ exists.

Case 4: $t \in \mathcal{R}(d)$, t is a right-limit point but not a left-limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d)$. Let $t_n \downarrow t$. We find that $e(t_n) \downarrow e(t)$, which implies $e^-(t_n) \downarrow e(t)$. But then $a^-(e^-(t_n)) \to a(e(t)) = y(t)$, and thus $x(t) = y(t)$. Then (4.2) implies that $\lim w(t_n)$ exists and equals $x(t) = w(t)$, and w is right-continuous at t. Now let $t_n \uparrow t$. Proceeding as in Case 3, we see that $\lim w(t_n)$ exists and equals $y^-(t)$.

Case 5: $t \in \mathcal{R}(d)$ is a left-limit point but not a right-limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d)$. For $t_n \downarrow t$, proceed as in Case 3, and for $t_n \uparrow t$ proceed as in Case 2.

Case 6: $t \in \mathcal{R}(d)$ is both left- and right-limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d)$. For $t_n \downarrow t$, proceed as in Case 4, and for $t_n \uparrow t$, proceed as in Case 2. □

For later use, we give the following sufficient condition for the continuity of Lévy Walk sample paths:

Lemma 4.4. *Let d be strictly increasing and assume $\mathrm{disc}(a) \subset \mathrm{disc}(d)$. Then the path w is continuous.*

Proof. We reiterate Cases 1-6 from the proof of Lemma 4.3, and show that $w^-(t) = w(t)$ in each case. Since d is strictly increasing, e is now continuous, i.e. $e^- = e$.

Case 1: nothing to show.

Case 2: If $t_n \downarrow t$, then for large n we have $e^-(t_n) = e^-(t)$, and hence $w(t) = x(t) = \lim a^-(e^-(t_n)) = \lim a^-(e^-(t)) = a^-(e^-(t)) = x^-(t) = w^-(t)$.

Case 3: is empty since d is strictly increasing.

Case 4: Let $t_n \uparrow t$. For large n, $e(t_n) = e(t)$. Hence $y^-(t) = \lim a(e(t_n)) = a(e(t)) = y(t)$. Letting $t_n \downarrow t$, we see that $x(t) = \lim a^-(e(t_n)) = a(e(t)) = y(t)$, and so $w(t) = x(t) = y(t) = y^-(t) = w^-(t)$.

Case 5: Is empty since d is strictly increasing and r.c.l.l.

Case 6: We have $w(t) = x(t)$ and $w^-(t) = x^-(t)$. Since e is (left- and right-) increasing at t, d must be continuous at $e(t)$, i.e. $e(t) \notin \mathrm{disc}(d)$. By assumption, $e(t) \notin \mathrm{disc}(a)$, and hence $x^-(t) = a^-(e(t)) = a(e(t))$. Letting $t_n \downarrow t$ and using that $e(t_n) \downarrow e(t)$, we see $x(t) = \lim a^-(e(t_n)) = a(e(t))$, i.e. $x^-(t) = x(t)$. □

In the above lemma, the assumption that d be strictly increasing is unnecessary; it was only used for convenience. We now prove the key ingredient in the continuous mapping argument. Throughout, we use the terminology of Whitt [48].

Proposition 4.5. *Endow the domain $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow}$ of Φ with the trace of the J_1 topology on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Endow the codomain $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ of Φ with the M_1 topology. Then Φ is continuous at every point (a, d) which is such that d is strictly increasing.*

Proof. Let $(a, d) \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow}$ be such that d is strictly increasing, and consider a sequence $\{(a_n, d_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathbb{D}_{u,\uparrow}$ such that $\lim(a_n, d_n) = (a, d)$ with respect to the J_1 topology. Write e_n, g_n, h_n, x_n and y_n for the paths which are associated with a_n and d_n in the same fashion as e, g, h, x and y are associated with a and d.

Recall the following equivalent description of convergence in $\mathbb{D}(E)$, where E is any separable metric space (for us, $E = \mathbb{R}^m$ or $E = \mathbb{R}$) [16, Th 3.6.5]: With respect to the topology J_1, we have $\xi_n \to \xi$ if and only if the following three statements hold simultaneously for every $t \geq 0$:

(J1) For every sequence $t_n \to t$ we have $\xi_n(t_n) \to \{\xi^-(t), \xi(t)\}$.

(J2) Let $t_n \to t$ be such that $\xi_n(t_n) \to \xi^-(t)$. If $s_n \le t_n$, then $\xi_n(s_n) \to \xi^-(t)$.
(J3) Let $t_n \to t$ be such that $\xi_n(t_n) \to \xi(t)$. If $u_n \ge t_n$, then $\xi_n(u_n) \to \xi(t)$.

Note that the first statement means that $\xi_n(t_n)$ has at most two limit points, either $\xi^-(t)$ or $\xi(t)$. If $t \notin \mathrm{disc}(\xi)$, then the three statements collapse to $\xi_n(t_n) \to \xi(t)$. In [44], it was pointed out that (J1) may be replaced by

(J1') For every sequence $t_n \to t$ we have $\xi_n^-(t_n) \to \{\xi^-(t), \xi(t)\}$,

which we will use below. We also give an equivalent description of convergence in $\mathbb{D}(E)$ with respect to the topology M_1, which can be derived from [48, Th 12.5.1(v)]: With respect to M_1, we have $\xi_n \to \xi$ if and only if the following two statements hold simultaneously:

(M1) Let $t \notin \mathrm{disc}(\xi)$. If $t_n \to t$, then $\xi_n(t_n) \to \xi(t)$.
(M2) Let $t \in \mathrm{disc}(\xi)$. If $s_n \to t$, $t_n \to t$, $u_n \to t$ where $s_n < t_n < u_n$, then $\|\xi_n(t_n) - [\xi_n(s_n), \xi_n(u_n)]\| \to 0$.

Note that in (M2), the brackets denote a line segment as defined earlier, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^m$.

The proof of Lemma 4.4 shows that $t \notin \mathrm{disc}(w)$ in the cases 1-5, as the assumption $\mathrm{disc}(a) \subset \mathrm{disc}(d)$ was only used in Case 6. Hence we need to show (M1) in the cases 1-5 and (M1) & (M2) in Case 6. From previous work [44, Prop 2.3] we know that

$$x_n \to x \text{ and } y_n \to y \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m) \text{ and } g_n \to g \text{ and } h_n \to h \text{ in } \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}) \tag{4.6}$$

with respect to J_1.

Case 1: e, g, h, x and y are all constant in a neighbourhood of t and thus continuous. Hence $g_n(t_n) \to g(t)$, $h_n(t_n) \to h(t)$, $x_n(t_n) \to x(t)$ and $y_n(t_n) \to y(t)$. Since $g(t) < t < h(t)$, for large n we have $g_n(t_n) < t_n < h_n(t_n)$, and hence $t_n \notin \mathcal{R}(d_n)$. It follows that $w_n(t_n) \to w(t)$.

Case 2: We have $g^-(t) = g(t) = t = h^-(t) < h(t)$ and, as noted before, $w(t) = w^-(t) = x(t) = x^-(t) = y^-(t)$. Hence $x_n(t_n) \to x(t)$, and $y_n(t_n) \to \{y^-(t), y(t)\}$ by (J1) applied to x_n and y_n. Split t_n into two subsequences t_n' and t_n'' such that $y_n(t_n') \to y^-(t)$ and $y_n(t_n'') \to y(t)$. Equation (4.2) immediately yields $w_n(t_n') \to w(t)$. It remains to show $w_n(t_n'') \to w(t)$. (J1) applied to the sequence (a_n, d_n) at $\tau_n = e_n(t_n'')$ then yields $(a_n(\tau_n), d_n(\tau_n)) \to \{(a^-(\tau), d^-(\tau)), (a(\tau), d(\tau))\}$ where $\tau = e(t)$. But we have $a_n(\tau_n) = a_n(e_n(t_n'')) = y_n(t_n'') \to y(t) = a(\tau)$, and hence it follows that $d_n(\tau_n) \to d(\tau)$, which means $h_n(t_n) = d_n(\tau_n) \to d(\tau) = h(t)$. By continuity at t, we have $g_n(t_n) \to g(t)$ and $x_n(t_n) \to x(t)$. In the second case of $w_n(t_n'')$ in (4.1), the fraction converges to 0, and hence both cases then yield the limit $x(t) = w(t)$.

Case 3: is empty since d is strictly increasing and r.c.l.l.

Case 4: We have $g^-(t) < g(t) = t = h^-(t) = h(t)$. As noted before, we have $w(t) = w^-(t) = x(t) = y(t) = y^-(t)$. Then $y_n(t_n) \to y(t)$, and $x_n(t_n) \to \{x^-(t), x(t)\}$. Again split t_n into two subsequences t_n' and t_n'' such that $x_n(t_n') \to x^-(t)$ and $x_n(t_n'') \to x(t)$. From (4.2), it follows that $w_n(t_n'') \to w(t)$. It remains to show $w_n(t_n') \to w(t)$. First, we observe that it is possible to choose a sequence $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$ so that $(x_n(t_n'), g_n(t_n')) = (a_n^-(e_n^-(t_n'+)), d_n^-(e_n^-(t_n'+)))$ and $(x_n^-(t_n'+\varepsilon_n), g_n^-(t_n'+\varepsilon_n)) = (a_n^-(e_n^-(t_n'+\varepsilon_n)), d_n^-(e_n^-(t_n'+\varepsilon_n)))$ yield the same limit as $n \to \infty$. Let $\tau_n = e_n^-(t_n'+\varepsilon_n)$. Then $\tau_n \to \tau = e(t)$. (J1') applied to the sequence (a_n^-, d_n^-) at

τ_n yields $(a_n^-(\tau_n), d_n^-(\tau_n)) \to \{(a^-(\tau), d^-(\tau)), (a(\tau), d(\tau))\}$. But $a_n^-(\tau_n) = x_n^-(t'_n) \to x^-(t) = a^-(\tau)$, and hence $d_n^-(\tau_n) \to d^-(\tau)$. This means $g_n(t'_n) \to g^-(t)$. If $g_n(t'_n) \in \mathcal{R}(d_n)$ for infinitely many t'_n, then $g_n(t'_n) = t'_n$ for infinitely many t'_n, which contradicts $g_n(t'_n) \to g^-(t) < t$. Hence for large n we have $g_n(t'_n) \notin \mathcal{R}(d_n)$. The second case in the definition (4.1) of $w_n(t'_n)$ applies. The fraction converges to 1, and $w(t'_n) \to y(t) = w(t)$.

Case 5: Is empty since d is strictly increasing and r.c.l.l.

Case 6: We have $g^-(t) = g(t) = t = h^-(t) = h(t)$, and moreover $w(t) = x(t) = y(t) = a(e(t))$ and $w^-(t) = x^-(t) = y^-(t) = a^-(e(t))$. Assuming that $t \notin \mathrm{disc}(w)$ yields $x^-(t) = x(t)$ and $y^-(t) = y(t)$, which means $x_n(t_n) \to x(t) = w(t)$ and $y_n(t_n) \to y(t) = w(t)$. Then $w_n(t_n) \to w(t)$ by (4.2).

Now we assume that $t \in \mathrm{disc}(w)$ and prove (M2). We have $\tau := e(t) \in \mathrm{disc}(a)$. By J_1-convergence of $a_n \to a$, there exists a sequence $\tau_n \to \tau$ such that $a_n(\tau_n) \to a(\tau)$ and $a_n^-(\tau_n) \to a^-(\tau)$.

Consider now the (possibly finite or empty) subsequence t'_n of t_n for which $y_n(t'_n) \to y^-(t)$. Then necessarily $e_n(t'_n) < \tau_n$ for all but finitely many n, or else (J3) would contradict $y_n(t'_n) \to y^-(t)$. Choose a sequence $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$ such that $e_n(t'_n) + \varepsilon_n < \tau_n$. Choose another sequence $\varepsilon'_n \downarrow 0$ such that $\lim x_n(t'_n) = \lim x_n^-(t'_n + \varepsilon'_n)$. Define $\varepsilon''_n = \min(\varepsilon'_n, \varepsilon_n)$. Then $\lim x_n(t'_n) = \lim x_n^-(t'_n + \varepsilon''_n) = \lim a_n^-(e_n^-(t'_n + \varepsilon''_n))$, and since $e_n^-(t'_n + \varepsilon''_n) \le e_n(t'_n + \varepsilon''_n) < \tau_n$, the last limit equals $a^-(\tau) = y^-(t)$. Hence we have shown that $x_n(t'_n) \to y^-(t) = w^-(t)$. Recalling that $w_n(t'_n) \in [x_n(t'_n), y_n(t'_n)]$, this means $w_n(t'_n) \to w^-(t)$. Let s'_n be the subsequence of s_n which matches t'_n. Since $s'_n < t'_n$, we have $e_n(s'_n) \le e_n(t'_n)$ and $e_n^-(s'_n) \le e_n(t'_n)$. (J2) then implies $y_n(s_n) \to y^-(t)$ and $x_n(s_n) \to y^-(t)$. Using (4.2), this means $w_n(s'_n) \to y^-(t) = w^-(t)$. (M2) hence holds for w_n and the subsequence t'_n, since $w_n(t'_n)$ and $w_n(s'_n)$ have the same limit.

Now consider the subsequence t''_n of t_n defined by $x_n(t''_n) \to x(t) = y(t)$. With an argument dual to the above, it can be shown that then $y_n(t''_n) \to y(t)$ as well. By (4.2), $w_n(t''_n) \to y(t)$, and using (J3), one shows $w_n(u''_n) \to y(t)$. Since $w_n(t''_n)$ and $w_n(u''_n)$ have the same limit, (M2) follows for the subsequence t''_n.

It remains to prove (M2) for the subsequence of remaining elements of t_n, s_n and u_n. For ease of notation we denote these elements again by t_n, s_n and u_n. We have $y_n(t_n) \to y(t) = w(t)$ and $x_n(t_n) \to x^-(t) = w^-(t)$.

Firstly, consider the members t_n, s_n and u_n for which $g_n(t_n) \le s_n < t_n < u_n < h_n(t_n)$. From the definition (4.1) of w, we see that $w_n(t_n) \in [w_n(s_n), w_n(u_n)]$, i.e. $\|w_n(t_n) - [w_n(s_n), w_n(u_n)]\| = 0$ and (M2) holds.

Secondly, for the members which satisfy $s_n < g_n(t_n) \le t_n < u_n < h_n(t_n)$, we have $w_n(t_n) \in [x_n(t_n), w_n(u_n)]$ by definition (4.1) of w. Then (M2) will hold if $\lim w_n(s_n) = \lim x_n(t_n) = x^-(t)$. Indeed, we have that $(s_n, t_n] \cap \mathcal{R}(d_n)$ is non-empty, and so $e_n(s_n) < e_n(t_n)$. As noted before, there exist $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$ such that $a^-(e(t)) = x^-(t) = \lim x_n(t_n) = \lim a_n^-(e_n^-(t_n+)) = \lim a_n^-(e_n^-(t_n + \varepsilon_n))$. Now $e_n^-(t_n + \varepsilon_n) \ge e_n(t_n) > e_n(s_n)$. Hence by (J2) applied to $a_n \to a$ we have $y_n(s_n) = a_n(e_n(s_n)) \to a^-(e(t)) = x^-(t)$. Moreover, $x_n(s_n) \to x^-(t)$ by (J2) applied to $x_n \to x$. By (4.2), $w_n(s_n) \to x^-(t)$.

Thirdly, for the members for which $g_n(t_n) \le s_n < t_n \le h_n(t_n) \le u_n$, we have $w_n(t_n) \in [w_n(s_n), y_n(t_n)]$ by definition (4.1) of w. Then (M2) will hold if $\lim w_n(u_n) =$

$\lim y_n(t_n) = y(t)$. Indeed, proceed similarly to the previous case. We have that $(t_n, u_n] \cap \mathcal{R}(d_n)$ is non-empty (note that $t_n = h_n(t_n)$ means that t_n is a right-limit point of $\mathcal{R}(d_n)$), and so $e_n(t_n) < e_n(u_n)$. We have $a(e(t)) = y(t) = \lim y_n(t_n) = \lim a_n(e_n(t_n))$. Let ε_n be such that $\lim x_n^-(u_n + \varepsilon_n) = \lim x_n(u_n)$. Now $e_n^-(u_n + \varepsilon_n) \geq e_n(u_n) > e_n(t_n)$. Hence by (J3) applied to $a_n \to a$ we have $\lim x_n(u_n) = \lim a_n^-(e_n^-(u_n+)) = \lim a_n^-(e_n^-(u_n + \varepsilon_n)) = a(e(t)) = y(t)$. Moreover, (J3) applied directly to $y_n \to y$ yields $y_n(u_n) \to y(t)$. By (4.2), $w_n(u_n) \to y(t)$.

Fourthly, consider the members for which $s_n < g_n(t_n) \leq t_n \leq h_n(t_n) \leq u_n$. As in "secondly" and "thirdly", it follows that $w_n(s_n) \to x^-(t)$ and $w_n(u_n) \to y(t)$. Since $w_n(t_n) \in [x_n(t_n), y_n(t_n)]$ and $x_n(t_n) \to x^-(t)$ and $y_n(t_n) \to y(t)$, (M2) follows. As the above four cases are exhaustive for the sequences t_n, s_n and u_n, the proof is finished. □

Lemma 4.7. *The mapping Φ is Borel measurable.*

Proof. We first note that the composition mapping is measurable, as shown in [11, p.232], and hence the two mappings $D(\mathbb{R}^m) \times D_{u,\uparrow} \ni (a, d) \mapsto y = a \circ e \in D(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and $D(\mathbb{R}^m) \times D_{u,\uparrow} \ni (a, d) \mapsto h = d \circ e \in D(\mathbb{R}^m)$ are measurable. Next, we show that the mapping $D(\mathbb{R}^m) \times D_{u,\uparrow} \ni (a, d) \mapsto x = (a^- \circ e^-)^+ \in D(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is measurable. Since the finite-dimensional sets in $D(\mathbb{R}^m)$ generate its Borel σ-field, it suffices to show that for every $t \geq 0$, the mapping $(a, d) \mapsto x(t)$ is measurable. For a sequence $t_n \downarrow t$, we have $x(t) = \lim a^-(e^-(t_n))$, and hence it suffices to show that the mapping $(a, d) \mapsto a^-(e^-(t))$ is measurable for every $t \geq 0$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $e_k^-(t)$ be the largest ratio i/k not larger than $e^-(t)$; we then have $\lim_{k\to\infty} a^-(e_k^-(t)) = a^-(e^-(t))$, and so it suffices to show that for every $t \geq 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the mapping $(a, d) \mapsto a^-(e_k^-(t))$ is measurable. Fix k and t, and let B be a Borel set in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then the set $\{(a, d) : a^-(e_k^-(t)) \in B\}$ is the union of $\{e_k^-(t) = 0\} \cap \{a(0) \in B\}$ with the sets

$$\left\{(a, d) : \frac{i}{k} \leq e^-(t) < \frac{i+1}{k}\right\} \cap \left\{(a, d) : a\left(\frac{i}{k}\right) \in B\right\},$$

where i is running through $\mathbb{Z}$. Since $d \mapsto e$ is measurable [48, Th.13.6.1] and $e^-(t) = \lim e(t_n)$ where $t_n \uparrow t$, the mapping $d \mapsto e^-(t)$ is measurable, and hence the above sets lie in the Borel σ-field of $D(\mathbb{R}^m)$. This shows that $(a, d) \mapsto x$ is measurable, and similarly to the above one shows that the map $D(\mathbb{R}^m) \times D_{u,\uparrow} \ni (a, d) \mapsto g = (d^- \circ e^-)^+$ is measurable.

Next, we note that due to the right-continuity of d, we have

$$\{(a, d) : t \in \mathcal{R}(d)\} = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{q\in\mathbb{Q}} \{(a, d) : d(q) \in [t, t + n^{-1}]\}$$

which is thus seen to be a Borel set in $D(\mathbb{R}^m)$.

Finally, on the set $\{t \notin \mathcal{R}(d)\}$, $w(t)$ is calculated from $x(t), y(t), g(t)$ and $h(t)$ via a sum, product and quotient; hence the set $\{(a, d) : w(t) \in B\}$ is seen to be a Borel set in $D(\mathbb{R}^m)$, since it can be written as the union of $\{t \in \mathcal{R}(d)\} \cap \{x(t) \in B\}$ with $\{t \notin \mathcal{R}(d)\} \cap \{w(t) \in B\}$. □

We can now apply the continuous mapping theorem.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $S(n)$ and $T(n)$ be the cumulative processes as in Section 2, and define the processes*

$$A_n(t) = B(n)S(\lfloor nt \rfloor), \qquad D_n(t) = b(n)T(\lfloor nt \rfloor) \tag{4.9}$$

where $B(n)$ and $b(n)$ are a spatial and a temporal scaling sequence. As $n \to \infty$, suppose that $\{(A_n(t), D_n(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ converges weakly in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ with respect to the topology J_1 to the process $\{(A(t), D(t))\}_{t\geq 0}$. Assume that $D(t)$ has strictly increasing sample paths a.s. Then the rescaled Lévy Walk $\{W_n(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ given by

$$W_n(t) = B(n)W(t/b(n))$$

converges weakly in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with respect to the M_1 topology to the limiting process $\{L(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ given by

$$L(t) = \begin{cases} X(t) & \text{if } t \in \mathcal{R}(D) \\ X(t) + \dfrac{t - G(t)}{H(t) - G(t)}(Y(t) - X(t)) & \text{if } t \notin \mathcal{R}(D), \end{cases} \tag{4.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(D) &= \{D(t) : t \geq 0\} \subset [0, \infty), & E(t) &= \inf\{r : D(r) > t\}, \\ X(t) &= A^-(E(t+)), & Y(t) &= A(E(t)), \\ G(t) &= D^-(E(t+)), & H(t) &= D(E(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the l.c.r.l. process $\{A^-(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ is given by $A^-(t) = A(t-)$ if $t > 0$ and $A^-(0) = A(0)$, and similarly for $D^-(t)$.

Proof. Our first step is to show $\Phi(A_n, D_n)(t) = W_n(t)$. We define the processes

$$\begin{aligned} E_n(t) &:= \inf\{r : D_n(r) > t\} = n^{-1}(N_{t/b(n)} + 1) \\ G_n(t) &:= D_n^-(E_n^-(t+)) = b(n)T(N_{t/b(n)}) \\ H_n(t) &:= D_n(E_n(t)) = b(n)T(N_{t/b(n)} + 1) \\ X_n(t) &:= A_n^-(E_n^-(t+)) = B(n)S(N_{t/b(n)}) \\ Y_n(t) &:= A_n(E_n(t)) = B(n)S(N_{t/b(n)} + 1). \end{aligned}$$

If $t \notin \mathcal{R}(D_n)$, then $G_n(t) < t < H_n(t)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(A_n, D_n)(t) &= X_n(t) + \frac{t - G_n(t)}{H_n(t) - G_n(t)}(Y_n(t) - X_n(t)) \\ &= B(n)S(N_{t/b(n)}) + \frac{t - b(n)T(N_{t/b(n)})}{b(n)J_{N(t/b(n))+1}} B(n) J_{N(t/b(n))+1} \Lambda_{N(t/b(n))+1} \\ &= B(n)\left(S(N_{t/b(n)}) + [t/b(n) - T(N_{t/b(n)})]\Lambda_{N(t/b(n))+1}\right) \\ &= W_n(t). \end{aligned}$$

If $t \in \mathcal{R}(D_n)$, then one finds $t = b(n)T(k)$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and then $t/b(n) = T(k)$ implies $k = N_{t/b(n)}$. But then $t - T(N_{t/b(n)}) = 0$, and

$$W_n(t) = X_n(t) = \Phi(A_n, D_n)(t).$$

Next, we check the assumptions of the Continuous Mapping Theorem, [11, p.30]. Endow $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ and $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with their Borel σ-fields (it is irrelevant which of the

topologies J_1 or M_1, see [48]). Let $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{P}$ denote the laws on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ of the processes associated with (4.9) and $\{(A_t, D_t)\}_{t\geq 0}$. Then our assumption reads as the weak convergence $\mathbf{P}_n \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}$, as $n \to \infty$. The domain of the path map Φ defined in (4.1) is a Borel set of $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ [44, Lem 2.1]. It is then straightforward to recast the topology, σ-field and probability measures $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{P}$ to the domain of Φ. We redefine these new probability measures again as $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{P}$, for ease of notation. By [16, Cor 3.2], $\mathbf{P}_n \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}$. The mapping Φ is measurable by Lemma 4.7. The sample paths $D(t)$ are strictly increasing $\mathbf{P}$ a.s. Hence by Proposition 4.5 the set of discontinuities of Φ is a $\mathbf{P}$-null set.

The statement of the Continuous Mapping Theorem is then that $\mathbf{P}_n \circ \Phi^{-1} \Rightarrow \mathbf{P} \circ \Phi^{-1}$, which is weak convergence in the codomain $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with respect to the topology M_1. We have checked earlier in this proof that $\mathbf{P}_n\Phi^{-1}$ is the law of the process $\{W_n(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$, and it is straightforward to see that $\mathbf{P}\Phi^{-1}$ is the law of the process $\{L(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$. □

Corollary 4.11. *Let $\beta \in (0,1)$. Then as $c \to \infty$, the rescaled Lévy Walk*

$$\left\{\frac{1}{c}W(ct)\right\}_{t\geq 0} \tag{4.12}$$

converges in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with respect to the topology U of uniform convergence to the process $\{L(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ given by (4.10) *and the Lévy process $\{(A(t), D(t))\}_{t\geq 0}$ with symbol $\psi(k,s)$ as in* (3.9).

Proof. In view of (3.12) we have

$$\{b(c)\,(S(\lfloor ct\rfloor), T(\lfloor ct\rfloor))\}_{t\geq 0} \xrightarrow{J_1} \{(A(t), D(t))\}_{t\geq 0}$$

as $c \to \infty$. Then by Theorem 4.8, the process $\{W_c(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ given by

$$W_c(t) = b(c)W(b(c)^{-1}t) \tag{4.13}$$

converges to $\{L(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ with respect to the topology M_1. But the sample paths of the limiting process $\{L(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ are a.s. continuous by Lemma 4.4, and hence convergence also holds in the stronger topology U. Since $b(c)^{-1}$ is regularly varying with index $1/\beta$ there exists a function $\tilde{b}(c)$ regularly varying with index β such that $b(\tilde{b}(c))^{-1} \sim c$ as $c \to \infty$. Now replace c by $\tilde{b}(c)$ in (4.13) and the result follows. □

Remark 4.14. The scaling limit $L(t)$ in the above corollary is 1-selfsimilar. Thus, its variance in the one-dimensional symmetric case equals $\mathrm{Var}(L(t)) = t^2 E[L^2(1)]$. We have analogous asymptotic behavior of the variance for the corresponding Lévy walk process $\mathrm{Var}(W(t)) \propto t^2$ as $t \to \infty$, see [27]. Such quadratic in time scaling of the variance is typical for *ballistic motion*. This kind of motion is characteristic for a Brownian particle at the early stage of its movement right after a collision, due to the inertia of the particle [22]. After this initial stage, a Brownian particle makes the transition from ballistic to diffusive (linear in time growth of variance) regime.

Remark 4.15. Note that the trajectories of the limit process $L(t)$ in the above corollary are *continuous*. Thus, it is a different process than the one obtained as a limit of the corresponding CTRW (see Example 5.4. in [7]). The difference is even more evident

in the particular one-dimensional case with $X_i = J_i$ (jumps equal to waiting times). Then, the Lévy walk is just a deterministic linear function $W(t) = t$. So is its scaling limit $L(t) = t$. However, the scaling limit of the corresponding CTRW is a jump process with one-dimensional distribution given by the generalized arcsine (Beta) law [7].

Corollary 4.16. *Let $\beta \in (1,2)$, and assume that the distribution of J belongs to the domain of attraction of a β-stable law. Let $\mu = \mathbf{E}[J]$. Assume further that $E[\Lambda_i] = 0$. Then there exists a scaling function $b(c)$ such that, as $c \to \infty$, the rescaled Lévy Walk*

$$\{b(c)W(\mu ct)\}_{t\geq 0} \tag{4.17}$$

converges in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with respect to the M_1 topology to the β-stable process $\{A(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ with spectral measure λ.

Proof. By assumption on J there exists a regularly varying function $b(c)$ with index $-1/\beta$ such that $b(c)T(\lfloor c\rfloor) - cb(c)\mu \Longrightarrow D$ as $c \to \infty$ for some β-stable random variable D. Moreover, for any $u > 0$ and Borel sets $V \subset S^{m-1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} cP\{b(c)J\Lambda \in B(u,V)\} &= cP\{b(c)J > u, \Lambda \in V\} \\ &= cP\{b(c)J > u\}\lambda(V) \to \phi_D(u,\infty)\lambda(V) \end{aligned}$$

where ϕ_D is the Lévy measure of D. Since $E[J\Lambda] = E[J]\cdot E[\Lambda] = 0$ this implies that $b(c)S(\lfloor c\rfloor) \Longrightarrow A$, where A is multivariate β-stable with spectral measure λ. Using Theorem 16.14 in [25] this implies

$$\big\{b(c)S(\lfloor ct\rfloor)\big\}_{t\geq 0} \xrightarrow{J_1} \big\{A(t)\big\}_{t\geq 0}.$$

Moreover, by the strong law of large numbers we have $c^{-1}T(\lfloor c\rfloor) \to \mu$ almost surely and hence, using Theorem 16.14 in [25] again we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu c}T(\lfloor ct\rfloor) \xrightarrow{J_1} \{t\}_{t\geq 0}.$$

Since the latter limit process is deterministic we get

$$\big\{\big(b(c)S(\lfloor ct\rfloor), (\mu c)^{-1}T(\lfloor ct\rfloor)\big)\big\}_{t\geq 0} \xrightarrow{J_1} \{(A(t),t)\}_{t\geq 0}\,.$$

Theorem 4.8 then yields the statement. □

Remark 4.18 (The superdiffusive regime). For $\beta \in (1,2)$, the variance of the Lévy walk grows as $\mathrm{Var}(W(t)) \propto t^{3-\beta}$ as $t \to \infty$, see [27]. This is the so-called *superdiffusive regime*. However, the second moment of the limit process $A(t)$ is infinite. Thus, the situation is different from the previously analyzed case $\beta \in (0,1)$, where the ballistic regime was observed both for Lévy walk and its scaling limit.

Remark 4.19 (Pathwise variation). From the definition of the Lévy Walk, it can be seen that the variation of almost every path $[0,t] \to W_t$ equals t. For the rescaled Lévy Walk (4.17) in the case $\beta \in (1,2)$, the variation at scale c equals $b(c)\,\mu ct$. As the scaling function $b(c)$ is of regular variation with exponent $-1/\beta$, this is seen to grow indefinitely as $c \to \infty$, with approximate speed $c^{1-1/\beta}$ as $c \to \infty$. This rings

well with the limit process being a stable process, which is known to have sample paths with infinite variation almost surely.

In the case $\beta \in (0,1)$, the rescaled Lévy Walk (4.12) almost surely has sample paths with variation t at all scales. We hence conjecture that the limiting process $L(t)$ also has sample paths with variation t on the interval $[0,t]$.

5. The governing equation

This section develops the governing equation of the one-dimensional marginals for the Lévy walk scaling limit process $\{L(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ obtained in Corollary 4.11 as well as its solution. As in [36] and [23], we consider pseudo-differential equations in the variables x and t, and solutions are defined in the "mild" sense. Our first step is to express the law of the Lévy Walk Limit in terms of its "model parameters" $\beta \in (0,1)$ and λ. For abbreviation, we introduce the 0-potential density

$$u(x,t) = \int_0^\infty p_u(x,t)\, du,$$

where $p_u(x,t)$ is the probability density of (A_u, D_u), see Proposition 3.13. The 0-potential $U(dx,dt) = u(x,t)\,dx\,dt$ may be interpreted as the measure which assigns to a Borel set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ the expected amount of time the process (A_u, D_u) stays in C. We note that D_u is a subordinator, and hence (A_u, D_u) is a transient Markov process, guaranteeing that the measure $U(dx,dt)$ is σ-finite [18]. Its Fourier-Laplace transform is given by $1/\psi(k,s)$.

Theorem 5.1. *The law of the Lévy Walk Limit process* (4.10) *with tail parameter* $\beta \in (0,1)$ *and spectral measure* λ *is Lebesgue absolutely continuous with density*

$$\rho_t(x) = \int_{S^{m-1}} \int_0^t u(x-(t-g)\theta, g) \frac{(t-g)^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)}\, dg\, \Lambda(d\theta). \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. First, we note that for every $t > 0$ one has $\mathbf{P}(t \in \mathcal{R}(D)) = 0$, since the subordinator D is strictly increasing with zero drift [10]. The joint law of X_t, G_t, Y_t and H_t can be easily read off from [44, Theorem 4.9] (there, the joint law of X_t, $t-G_t$, Y_t and $H_t - t$ is given):

$$\mathbf{E}[f(X_t, G_t, Y_t, H_t)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_0^t u(x,g) \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{t-g}^\infty f(x,g,x+z,g+w)\, \phi(dz,dw)\, dg\, dx, \tag{5.3}$$

which in somewhat more intuitive notation reads

$$\mathbf{P}\left((X_t, G_t, Y_t, H_t) \in (dx, dg, dy, dh)\right) = \mathbf{1}(g < t < h) u(x,g) \phi(dy - x, dh - g)\, dx\, dg \tag{5.4}$$

We can hence use (4.10) to calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}[f(L_t)] = \mathbf{E}\left[f\left(X_t + \frac{t-G_t}{H_t-G_t}(Y_t - X_t)\right)\right] \\
&= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int\limits_0^t u(x,g) \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int\limits_{t-g}^{\infty} f\left(x + \frac{t-g}{w}z\right)\,\phi(dz,dw)\,dg\,dx \\
&= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int\limits_0^t u(x,g) \int\limits_0^{\infty} \frac{\beta r^{-1-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \int\limits_{S^{m-1}} \mathbf{1}(t<g+r) f\left(x + \frac{t-g}{r}r\theta\right)\,\Lambda(d\theta)\,dr\,dg\,dx
\end{aligned}$$

from which (5.2) follows. □

It is now easy to calculate the Fourier-Laplace transform of the law of L_t, at first with θ held fixed (or rather λ concentrated at θ):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{\infty} \mathbf{E}[\exp(i\langle k, L_t\rangle)]e^{-st}\,dt \\
&= \int_0^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_0^t u(x,g)\frac{(t-g)^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)}e^{-st}\exp(i\langle k, x+(t-g)\theta\rangle)\,dg\,dx\,dt \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_0^{\infty} u(x,g)\int_g^{\infty}\frac{(t-g)^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)}e^{-st}\exp(i\langle k, x+(t-g)\theta\rangle)\,dt\,dg\,dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_0^t u(x,g)\int_0^{\infty}\frac{v^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)}e^{-s(g+v)}\exp(i\langle k, x+v\theta\rangle)\,dv\,dg\,dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_0^t u(x,g)\exp(i\langle k,x\rangle - sg)\int_0^{\infty}\exp(-(s-i\langle k,\theta\rangle)v)\frac{v^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)}\,dv\,dg\,dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\psi(k,s)}(s-i\langle k,\theta\rangle)^{\beta-1}
\end{aligned}$$

For general λ, we then have

$$\int_0^{\infty} dt\, e^{-st}\mathbf{E}[\exp(i\langle k, L_t\rangle)] = \frac{\int_{S^{m-1}}(s-i\langle k,\theta\rangle)^{\beta-1}\lambda(d\theta)}{\psi(k,s)} \tag{5.5}$$

Now recall from [36] and [23] that, given a weakly measurable family $h(dx,t)$ $(t\geq 0)$ of bounded measures on $\mathbb{R}^m$, we say that a family $\rho_t(dx)$ of probability measures is the *mild solution* to the pseudo-differential equation $\psi(i\nabla_x, \partial_t)\rho_t(dx) = h(dx,t)$ if its Fourier-Laplace transform (FLT) solves the corresponding algebraic equation. In this sense, we can prove:

Theorem 5.6. *The density $\rho_t(x)$ of the Lévy Walk limit process satisfies the following pseudo-differential equation on $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$:*

$$\int_{S^{m-1}}\left(\partial_t + \langle\theta, \nabla_x\rangle\right)^{\beta}\rho_t(x)\;\lambda(d\theta) = \frac{t^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)}\delta(\|x\|-t)\lambda\left(d\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right) \tag{5.7}$$

Proof. First, we note that the tempered distribution on the right-hand side can be represented as the Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$

$$(dx, dt) \mapsto \frac{t^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \int_{S^{m-1}} \delta(dx - t\theta)\lambda(d\theta)\, dt. \tag{5.8}$$

By a straightforward calculation, this has the Fourier-Laplace transform

$$\int_{S^{m-1}} (s - i\langle k, \theta\rangle)^{\beta-1}\lambda(d\theta). \tag{5.9}$$

The statement then follows from (5.5) and (3.10). □

We close with an example of the developed theory:

Example 5.10. Let us consider the one-dimensional symmetric case, so that $\lambda(d\theta) = (\delta(d\theta - 1) + \delta(d\theta + 1))/2$. It follows from (5.5) and (3.9) that

$$\bar{\rho}_s(k) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{(s - ik)^{\beta-1} + (s + ik)^{\beta-1}}{(s - ik)^{\beta} + (s + ik)^{\beta}}.$$

Therefore

$$\left.\frac{\partial^2 \bar{\rho}_s(k)}{\partial k^2}\right|_{k=0} = -\frac{1-\beta}{s^3},$$

and an inverse Laplace transform immediately recovers the ballistic scaling regime

$$\mathbf{E}[L^2(t)] = t^2(1-\beta)/2.$$

The pseudo-differential equation for $\rho_t(dx)$ then reads

$$\frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^{\beta} + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^{\beta}\right] q(x,t) = [\delta(x-t) + \delta(x+t)]\frac{t^{-\beta}}{\Gamma(1-\beta)}.$$

Here, the operators $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mp \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^{\beta}$ are also called fractional material derivatives with Fourier-Laplace symbols $(s \mp ik)^{\beta}$. These were introduced in [42] as a fractional extension of the standard material derivative.

References

[1] M. Ashbaugh, B.S. Rajput, K. Rama-Murthy and C. Sundberg (1992) Remarks on the positiveity of densities of stable laws. *Probab. Math. Stat.* **13(1)**, 77–86.

[2] B. Baeumer and M.M. Meerschaert (2001) Stochastic solutions for fractional Cauchy problems. *Frac. Calc. Appl. Anal.* **4(4)**, 481–500.

[3] B. Baeumer, M.M. Meerschaert and J. Mortensen (2005) Space-time fractional derivative operators. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.***133(8)**, 2273–2282.

[4] B. Baeumer, M.M. Meerschaert and E. Nane (2009) Brownian subordinators and fractional Cauchy problems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **361**, 3915–3930.

[5] P. Barthelemy, P.J. Bertolotti and D.S. Wiersma (2008) A Lévy flight for light. *Nature* **453**, 495–498.

[6] P. Becker-Kern, M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffler (2004) Limit theorem for continuous time random walks with two time scales. *J. Applied Probab.* **41**, 455–466.

[7] P. Becker-Kern, M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffler (2004) Limit theorems for coupled continuous time random walks. *Ann. Probab.* **32**, 730–756.

[8] W.J. Bell *Searching Behaviour.* Chapman & Hall, London, 1999.

[9] H.C. Berg *Random Walks in Biology.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1983.

[10] J. Bertoin, (1999) Subordinators: examples and applications. Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics, 191.
[11] P. Billingsley *Convergence of Probability Measures*. John Wiley & Sons Inc, New York, 2nd edition, 1968.
[12] D. Brockmann (2010) Human mobility and spatial disease dynamics. Chap. 1, pp. 1?24 in Reviews of Nonlinear Dynamics and Complexity, Vol. 2, edited by H. Shuster, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, 2010.
[13] D. Brockmann, L. Hufnagel and T. Geisel (2006) The scaling laws of human travel. *Nature* **439**, 462–465.
[14] M. Buchanan (2008) Ecological modelling: The mathematical mirror to animal nature. *Nature* **453**, 714–716.
[15] B. Dybiec (2008) Random strategies of contact tracking. *Physica A* **387**, 4863–4870.
[16] S.N. Ethier and Thomas G. Kurtz *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2nd edition, 2005.
[17] D. Froemberg and E. Barkai (2013) Time-averaged Einstein relation and fluctuating diffusivities for the Lévy walk. *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 030104.
[18] K.L. Chung and J.B. Walsh (2005) Markov processes, Brownian motion, and time symmetry (Vol. 249). Springer.
[19] M.C. Gonzales, C.A. Hidalgo, and A.L. Barabási (2008) Understanding individual human mobility patterns. *Nature* **453**, 779–782.
[20] M.G. Hahn, K. Kobayashi, J. Ryvkina and S. Umarov (2011) On time-changed Gaussian processes and their associated Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations. *Electronic Communications in Probability* **16**, 150–164.
[21] J. Hoffmann-Jørgensen (1969) Markov sets. *Math. Scand.* **24**, 145–166.
[22] R. Huang et al. (2011) Direct observation of the full transition from ballistic to diffusive Brownian motion in a liquid. *Nature Phys.* **7**, 576–580.
[23] A. Jurlewicz, P. Kern, M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffer (2012) Fractional governing equations for coupled random walks. *Comput. Math. App.* **64**, 3021–3036.
[24] A. Jurlewicz, M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffler (2011) Cluster continuous time random walks. *Stud. Math.* **205(1)**, 13–30.
[25] O. Kallenberg *Foundations of Modern Probability* 2nd ed. Springer 2001.
[26] J. Klafter, A. Blumen and M.F. Shlesinger (1987) Stochastic pathway to anomalous diffusion. *Phys. Rev. A* **35**, 3081–3085.
[27] J. Klafter, A. Blumen, G. Zumofen and M.F. Shlesinger (1990) Lévy walk approach to anomalous diffusion. *Physica A* **168**, 637–645.
[28] J. Klafter and I.M. Sokolov *First Steps in Random Walks. From Tools to Applications.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011.
[29] V.N. Kolokoltsov (2009) Generalized Continuous-Time Random Walks, Subordination by Hitting Times, and Fractional Dynamics. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **53(4)**, 594.
[30] M. Magdziarz, W. Szczotka and P. Zebrowski (2012) Langevin picture of Levy walks and their extensions. *J. Stat. Phys.* **147**, 74–96.
[31] M. Magdziarz, W. Szczotka and P. Zebrowski (2013) Asymptotic behaviour of random walks with correlated temporal structure. *Proc. R. Soc. A* **469** 20130419.
[32] G. Margolin and E. Barkai (2005) Nonergodicity of blinking nanocrystals and other Lévy-walk processes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 080601.
[33] M.M. Meerschaert, E. Nane and P. Vellaisamy (2009) Fractional Cauchy problems on bounded domains. *Ann. Probab.* **37**, 979–1007.
[34] M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffler *Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Random Vectors: Heavy Tails in Theory and Practice*. Wiley Interscience, New York, 2001.
[35] M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffler (2004) Limit theorems for continuous-time random walks with infinite mean waiting times. *J. Appl. Probab.* **41**, 623–638.

[36] M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffler (2008) Triangular array limits for continuous time random walks. *Stoch Proc. Appl.***118**, 1606–1633.
[37] M.M. Meerschaert and A. Sikorskii *Stochastic models for fractional calculus.* De Gruyter, Berlin, 2012.
[38] R. Metzler and J. Klafter (2000) The random walk's guide to anomalous diffusion: a fractional dynamics approach. *P*hys. Rep. **339**, 1–77.
[39] E.W. Montroll and G.H. Weiss (1965) Random walks on lattices. II. *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 167–181.
[40] H. Scher and E.W. Montroll (1975) Anomalous transit-time dispersion in amorphous solids. *Phys. Rev. B* **12**, 2455–2477.
[41] D.S. Silvestrov and J.L. Teugels (2004) Limit theorems for mixed max-sum processes with renewal stopping. *Ann. Applied Probab.* **14**, 1838–1868.
[42] I.M. Sokolov and R. Metzler (2003) Towards deterministic equations for Lévy walks: The fractional material derivative. *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 010101(R).
[43] T.H. Solomon, E.R. Weeks and H.L. Swinney (1993) Observation of anomalous diffusion and Lévy flights in a two-dimensional rotating flow. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3975?-3978.
[44] P. Straka and B.I. Henry (2011) Lagging and leading coupled continuous time random walks, renewal times and their joint limits. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* **121(2)**, 324–336.
[45] P. Straka (2013) Forward and Backward Governing Equations for Anomalous Diffusion Models Based on the Continuous Time Random Walk. *arXiv:1212.1197*
[46] W. Szczotka and P. Żebrowski (2012) On fully coupled continuous-time random walks. *Appl. Math.* **39**, 87–102.
[47] M. Teuerle, P. Zebrowski and M. Magdziarz (2012) Multidimensional Levy walk and its scaling limits. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 385002.
[48] W. Whitt *Stochastic-Process Limits: An Introduction to Stochastic-Process Limits and their Application to Queues*. Springer, New York, 2001.